

A BIRD IN THE HAND IS WORTH TWO IN THE BUSH

Marvin E. Kirsh

With regards to the referral "our own theory of language" I, first, would be able to find no better starting point for all theory. Second, find that a deflating influence exists upon the common citizen with regards to the great complexity of ideas put forth upon himself and the environment that he must not only endure, but find his continuance from a positive application of its' resources. A division between the human spirit, his theology, philosophy, and the creations of science from theory created and assembled as a (scientifically)dedicated subset of language that is composed from the perspectives of persons representing a small sample of a total possible diversity in language, is apparent. Science method, technology, with its' mechanical logic as logically appealing, become instantiated, hence oppressive, and individually repressive psychologically to a more diverse outlook. Though humorous in suggestion, this conflict (of interests) might best, in as few words as possible, result as an entailment of the common phrase "a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush"-as science puts into the hand new tools, contrivances to endure nature, improve the human lot where as the gains of theology are always in the "proverbial bush". It is in this sense that mankind comes to abuse natural resources, and replace his own resources with those defined by others. One's impression of even an artistic creation, cannot be supplanted with the description and intention of the creating artist. Science, in order to find any empirical application must begin with the empirical. It is my opinion that it also cannot transcend the empirical enroute to explanation, and that in doing so is violating to the self as the creator of theory, and that such described theories are not valid. Objectivity, in terms of science, has no source of self objectivity but his own witness as a universally instantiatable fact and lingual theory creation which is also a universally instantiatable fact but diverse on each unique individual basis, in that no other appearing more tangible and constant-consistent theories can or do exist, but of the innate and self constructed ones employed in the processes of witness and social intercourse. *Ontology must be a good process of ornithology*, perhaps we should not attach ourselves to the first bird that falls into our hands(from science theory), or to over look one that already exists that is common, comprehensible, and self created. In this respect it would be perhaps wise to avoid a compulsive dependence on rationality and logic to seek a category and ordering for each discovery in a universal domain. I do not think that in final analysis the language of science will find validity as a genuine or acceptable subset of human communication. Science theory we compose, of extrapolation and imagination will be found misaligned in category, topic and title, to contain irrational meaning derived of the elements of a route that traverses beyond the empirical and witnessable world. *With it we will ultimately damage our personal resources and diversities, the language theorizing employed to construct language*, which exists as the unique and only empirically true and valid footing of inquiry and progress. A burning bush sheds of the objective, physical light only. One burning at both ends, a process(of time related change - motion) of a very similar nature, is potentially indistinguishable from the other, and potentially leaves no route to a subject darkness that may reside beyond a linguistically created assimilation-the existence of a unique burning source from which the remainder is innately construed, in the immediate sense, as derived. *Again, ontology must be a good process of ornithology.*